REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 6, and 11 are independent. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Applicant has amended 11 to call for a "tangible machine-readable medium."

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for allegedly being non-statutory. In particular, the Examiner stated that "[t]he claimed term, machine, for use to read the instruction stored on the article is nonstatutory," and suggested that the term be changed to "computer."

With all due respect, Applicant does not understand why the Examiner considers the recitation of the term "machine" , as opposed to "computer", to render claim 11 non-statutory, since a computer is a type of a machine. Furthermore, a machine is a tangible object. Applicant submits that because the preamble of claim 11 requires the instructions to be stored on a tangible machine-readable medium, claim 11 recites statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Before discussing how applicant's claims distinguish over the art it may be helpful to the Examiner if Applicant addresses some general points concerning principal components. As described in Applicant's specification on page 4, lines 8-14, principal components are axes determined from principal component analysis (PCA):

> Principal component analysis (PCA) is a linear algebraic transform. PCA is used to determine the most efficient orthogonal basis for a given set of data. When determining the most efficient axes, or principal components of a set of data using PCA, a strength (i.e., an importance value called herein as a coefficient) is assigned to each principal component of the data set.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meisel et al., U.S. Patent 5,054,085.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of speech recognition that requires "determining principal components of received speech ... and comparing the principal components ... to stored principal components to find a set of the stored principal components having a specified degree of similarity to the determined principal components ..."

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner equates the speech parameters determined by the system of Meisel with the principal components recited in claim 1. In particular the Examiner states: "**Meisel teaches ... determining speech parameters (principal components) representing amongst other speech characteristics, consecutive pitch periods/format parameters (a component representing the pitch period.**"

Applicant disagrees. None of the speech parameters described in Meisel are disclosed or suggested to be principal components. For example, the speech parameters explicitly disclosed in col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 3 of Meisel do not include principal components:

> The present invention processes an independent body of speech during an enrollment process and creates a set of parameters representing the speaker's pitch, the frequency spectrum of the speech as a function of time, and certain measurements of the speech signal in the time-domain.

In this regard, pitch, frequency spectrum, and time-domain measurements are not principal components. Nowhere does Meisel disclose or suggest determining principal components.

Claims 6 and 11 recite limitations that are similar to those of claim 1 and therefore distinguish over Meisel for at least the same reasons as claim 1.As such the independent claims are patentable over the applied art.

Each of the dependent claims is also believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, has not been discussed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or

other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claims, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claims does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned agent can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at 617-521-7012.

Enclosed is a three-month Petition for Extension of Time Fee, please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050 referencing Attorney Docket No. 14501-004001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 1, 2007

Cynthia L. Caramana
Reg. No. 60,628

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21747117.doc